

Summary of Public Meetings December 2004/January 2005

Following are some of the major questions/comments that came out of the public meetings. We had someone taking notes but only capturing major comments or issues that should be brought back to the team.

Comments Common to All Meetings:

- Will one of the alternatives show difference in management for each of the GAs across the two forests (ie. in one Alt., the Priest GA may look like Alt. D mapping and the Yaak GA may look like Alt. B mapping). In looking at the presentation of the conceptual ideas of the mapped alternatives, the public (internally and externally) didn't feel that we captured the differences between the GAs desired condition and how we should manage in any of the alternatives. Need to see the results of the mapped Alternatives before determining if need to develop another alternative. Most everyone is anxious to see how the Management Areas are allocated in each of the Alternatives, specifically for their Geographic Area.
- Better define the terms we are using in describing the MAs and Alternatives (ie. low, moderate and high intensity, restoration, rehabilitation, primarily etc.)
- Close cooperation and communication with adjacent forests for consistent management across imaginary boundaries.
- Management of proposed wilderness.

11/29/04 – Moscow, ID:

General:

- Could there be another alternative – a mix of the alternatives depending on the Geographic Area Desired Condition statements from the workgroups that is more specific for each GA?
- Concern about using the term “decision space” and feels that if the team is working within the decision space, it precludes any major changes from being made to the plans. (Troy Merrill).
- Hope that the MAs are more clearly defined when final (ie. “primarily” non-motorized – what does this mean?)
- Strongly encourage closer cooperation, collaboration, and communication with neighboring Forests to help develop uniform mgmt. strategies on a wider landscape scale.

Recreation/Access/Special Designations:

- Need to limit numbers and types of uses on trails, need to get away from motorized vs. non-motorized ends of the issue.
- How are we going to manage Proposed Wilderness and Wilderness Study Areas different in the new plans?
- Why aren't you doing Suitability Assessments for W&SRs in the Forest Plan?
- Define the “seasons”.

11/30/04 – Spokane, WA:

General:

- Could there be another alternative – a mix of the alternatives depending on the Geographic Area Desired Condition statements from the workgroups that is more specific for each GA? A more balanced alternative would be nice.

- Need criteria or measures to know when the districts are meeting the Desired condition for 6a, 6b, or 6c.
- Will funding be available for the more passive restoration or primarily in the more intensively timber managed areas?

Wildlife:

- How was the Caribou Strategy and results of the content analysis distributed?

Watersheds:

- June Berquist and others – requested that we look at impacts (effects) of different non-motorized and motorized uses (ie. mtn. Bikes, ATVs, single track vehicles, horses) in relation to that different types of uses have different impacts on watersheds.
- Concern with watershed conditions in the Spokane area and the heavy metals flowing through the system. (John Osborne)

Special Designations:

- Like to see the list of eligible W&SRs.

Fire:

- Would like to see how we are proposing to manage fire in the different MAs.

Timber/Recreation:

- Question why timber production, roads and motorized recreation are always lumped together, especially in the MAs.

12/1/04 – Sandpoint, ID:

General:

- Could there be another alternative – a mix of the alternatives depending on the Geographic Area Desired Condition statements from the workgroups that is more specific for each GA?
- Maps should be made for the color-blind users.
- Concern about are we addressing global warming & carbon dioxide issues (sequestering of carbon).
- Seems like the FS is contradicting itself in that in 6c we have the most watershed and vegetation restoration and we also are emphasizing the most motorized travel?

Special Designations:

- The proposed wilderness has been tied up for 20 years. How long before we do not treat as proposed wilderness considering that Congress hasn't acted on any of the proposed wilderness areas in the 1987 Forest Plans?
- Since the 1987 Forest Plans, have concerns materialized within the proposed wilderness areas? Have they deteriorated?

Recreation/Access:

- How is dispersed winter motorized recreation managed in 5a and 5b?
- As population ages and there are more disabled public, why aren't we looking at more access?
- When you put in a temporary road and then close it after you're done with the management activity, you still have the effects and can still see the visibility of the road corridor.

12/2/04 – St. Maries, ID:

General:

- MA7 – what about including Hiawatha trail, Cda river corridor, and St. Joe corridor in the MA7's?
- Could there be another alternative – a mix of the alternatives depending on the Geographic Area Desired Condition statements from the workgroups that is more specific for each GA?

- How are the Goals and Objectives going to be measured? Didn't happen in 1987 Plans.
- Need to define "restoration" and "rehabilitation".
- Would like to see a financial breakdown for land status based on MA or as specific as possible.

Vegetation/Timber:

- Intensity of management in the MAs is very confusing, needs to be better defined.
- Requests that timber harvest numbers be attainable, reliable, and realistic.

12/6/04 – Eureka & Fortine, MT:

General:

- How does our management direction affect private landowners adjacent to National Forest System lands?
- When people want to harvest in areas that already have been harvested for economic security, they need to consider that recovery/restoration needs to occur before you can contribute towards economic sustainability of a community. What are the sustainable levels of an ecosystem?
- Could there be another alternative – a mix of the alternatives depending on the Geographic Area Desired Condition statements from the workgroups that is more specific for each GA?
- Maybe need an MA that allows us to deal with catastrophic events or make sure we have direction within the existing MAs to this issue.
- Would like to see a formal comment period before the DEIS is released on the draft Alternatives. Want to be more involved up front.

Timber:

- Really need to better define low, moderate and high intensity management terms.

Fire:

- Really interested in how fire suppression direction changed between the MAs.

Special Designations:

- Why don't we have an MA for National Recreation Areas? Will we leave Ten Lakes WSA as a WSA, propose it as wilderness or could it be allocated to a NRA?
- How do you manage the MA that surrounds an SIA or RNA to perpetuate the character of the protected area?

12/7/04 Troy, MT:

General:

- Could there be another alternative – a mix of the alternatives depending on the Geographic Area Desired Condition statements from the workgroups that is more specific for each GA?

Special Designations:

- What criteria is being used to determine eligibility of W&SRs?
- What's the process for recommending Experimental forests?

Vegetation:

- Will the forest plan have direction that addresses using native species (vegetation) for restoration work in fire areas?
- How is the KNF Weed EIS integrating with FPR?

12/8/04 Yaak, MT:

General: Nothing major to add.

12/9/04 Heron, MT:

General:

- Could there be another alternative – a mix of the alternatives depending on the Geographic Area Desired Condition statements from the workgroups that is more specific for each GA?

Fire:

- Lots of question about how we are going to manage fires in the MAs and how we will restore after fires.

12/13/04 Libby, MT:

General:

- Need to define “restoration” and “rehabilitation” and how we are going to use these in FPR. Restoration was only defined in the AMS and in relation to fire.
- Need to define what we mean by “wilderness characteristic”.
- Could there be another alternative – a mix of the alternatives depending on the Geographic Area Desired Condition statements from the workgroups that is more specific for each GA?
- Are we going to be specific in the management direction or will it be a “range”?

Recreation/Access:

- Is the no net increase in groomed and ungroomed snowmobile trails in 5a and 5b for the entire MA or is it only for that portion of the MA that contains the identified LAUs? If it is the entire MA, what is the reason for having the standard beyond the LAU?

Special Interest Areas:

- Are there acreage limitations for SIAs, RNAs, or experimental forests?

12/14/04 Bonners Ferry, ID:

General: Nothing major to add.

12/15/04 Priest Lake, ID:

General:

- Could there be another alternative – a mix of the alternatives depending on the Geographic Area Desired Condition statements from the workgroups that is more specific for each GA?
- Need to add social and economics to each of the alternatives. Social and Economic is important to all communities especially the Priest area and is needed at the GA level when mapping the alternatives.
- What is the status of the Roadless Rule and how it will affect FPR?

Access/Wildlife:

- A lot of concern about how we applying MA 5a and 5b for winter groomed and ungroomed snowmobile use and how the LAU affects where these MAs are located. If the Lynx Amendment takes affect as proposed, it would eliminate the language of “no net increase in miles of groomed and ungroomed trails”.

Fire:

- Concern about the fire management standards within each MA. Would like to see that we’re proposing

12/16/04 Coeur d’Alene, ID:

General:

- Could there be another alternative – a mix of the alternatives depending on the Geographic Area Desired Condition statements from the workgroups that is more specific for each GA?
- What is the process for the decision maker in selecting an alternative for implementation.

Special Designations:

- A lot of questions about management of proposed wilderness, WSAs, and designation of these areas.

Timber:

- What is the definition of “suitable” in terms of timber production?

Correspondence after public meetings:

We also received letters and emails after the meetings, specifically commenting about the meetings. Following are some of the major concerns:

- The public really wants to see how we used their comments in development of the alternatives, at least the applicable comments to the alternatives. Is the Forest Service listening to us and being responsive? They are very anxious for the meetings where we will show how the Management Areas are allocated for each of the Alternatives.
- Want a formal comment period before the DEIS on the Alternatives.
- Would like to see a true non-motorized MA (one that is not proposed wilderness but a backcountry type MA).
- Priest Lake really wants the social and economic issue reflected in the Management Areas specifically in the allocation of MAs for their GA.